

CAZON  
HO 40  
- R25

Government  
Publications

3 1761 11894324 0



Ministry of  
Housing

# RENTAL MARKET SURVEY

in eight Ontario cities  
October, 1978

POLICY AND PROGRAM  
DEVELOPMENT SECRETARIAT

DECEMBER, 1978

ATTENTION		INITIAL
<hr/>		
REC'D NOV 26 1979		
COPY TO		DATE INITIALS
REPLY	<hr/>	
FILE	PN	

HOM.O  
78

This volume was donated to  
the University of Toronto by  
Derek J.W. Little  
President, Municipal Planning  
Consultants Co. Ltd.



Ministry of  
Housing

# RENTAL MARKET SURVEY

in eight Ontario cities  
October, 1978

**Hon. Claude Bennett**  
Minister of Housing

**Donald Crosbie**  
Deputy Minister

Mr. Nizar Kahan of the Policy and Program Development Secretariat of the Ministry of Housing developed the survey design and wrote the report.

Survey operations were carried out by Canadian Facts Co. Ltd.

December, 1978

Policy and Program Development Secretariat  
(416) 965-7025

CH 20N  
HO  
-R 25  
23



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
BACKGROUND	1
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	4
SECTION I	- RENT INCREASES
	- October, 1978 Survey Results
	- Comparisons of Rent Increases (1978 and 1977 Surveys)
	10
SECTION II	- RENT LEVELS
	- October, 1978 Survey Results
	- Comparisons of Rent Levels (1978 and 1977 Surveys)
	25
SECTION III	- MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES
	- October, 1978 Survey Results
	- Comparisons of Maintenance and Services (1978 and 1977 Surveys)
	43
SECTION IV	- TECHNICAL APPENDIX
	54

## LIST OF TABLES

### SECTION I

#### Rent Increases

1.1	Renter Mobility during the Period October 1977 to October 1978.	14
1.2	Percentage of Non-Movers by Building Size (for the Period October 1977 - October 1978).	15



TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

1.3	Percentage of those Renting Same Unit with Zero Rent Increase by Building Size.	16
1.4	Average and Median Percentage Rent Increase October 1977 to October 1978, (Non-Movers).	17
1.5	Distribution of Percentage Rent Increase.	18
1.6	Percentage Rent Increase by Building Size.	19
1.7	Percentage Rent Increase by Annual Family Income.	20

Comparisons of 1978 and 1977 Surveys

1.8	Percentage Renting Same Unit/ Different Unit.	21
1.9	Distribution of Percentage Rent Increase (Non-Movers).	22
1.10	Average Percentage Rent Increase (Non-Movers).	23

SECTION II

Rent Levels

2.1	October 1978 Average Rents by Unit Size.	31
2.2	October 1978 Rent Distribution (All Units).	32
2.3	Distribution of Rent by Unit Size.	33
2.4	October 1978 Rent Distribution by Building Size.	37
2.5	Distribution of Separate Charges.	38



TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

Comparisons of 1978 and 1977 Surveys

2.6	Annualized Percentage Change in Average October 1978 Rent and Average September 1977 Rent for Total Rental Stock.	39
2.7	Examination of Percentage Rent Increase and Annualized Percentage Change in Average Rents.	40
2.8	Rent Level Distribution, September 1977, October 1978.	41

SECTION III

Maintenance and Services

3.1	Quality of Maintenance and Services - Tenant Perception.	46
3.2	Current Quality of Maintenance and Services by Building Size - Tenant Perception.	47
3.3	Current Quality of Maintenance and Services by Annual Family Income - Tenant Perception.	48
3.4	Change in Level of Maintenance and Services - Tenant Perception.	49
3.5	Change in Level of Maintenance and Services by Building Size - Tenant Perception.	50
3.6	Change in Level of Maintenance and Services by Annual Family Income - Tenant Perception.	51

Comparisons of 1978 and 1977 Surveys

3.7	Current Quality of Maintenance and Services - Tenant Perception.	52
3.8	Change in Level of Maintenance and Services - Tenant Perception.	53

Digitized by the Internet Archive

in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

SECTION IV

Technical Appendix

4.1	Sample Sizes.	58
4.2	Approximate Standard Errors of Percentages.	59
4.3	October 1978 Average Rents by Unit Size with Standard Errors (95% Confidence Level).	60
4.4	Sample Distribution by Unit Size.	61
4.5	Sample Distribution by Building Size.	62
4.6	Sample Distribution by Dwelling Type.	63



RENTAL MARKET SURVEY  
IN EIGHT ONTARIO CITIES - OCTOBER, 1978

BACKGROUND

The 1978 Rental Market Survey is the fourth of its kind conducted for the Ministry of Housing. This year's survey was conducted by Canadian Facts Company Ltd. in the month of October. Telephone interviews were used to survey private rental housing units in eight Ontario cities: Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, London, Kingston, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay. The 1978 survey was a complete replication of the 1977 Rental Market Survey.

There were three basic objectives of the Rental Market Survey:

1. To determine current rent levels (rents paid for October, 1978) in selected Ontario cities.
2. To determine the rent changes between October 1977 and October 1978 faced by individual renters. However, the survey design does not permit rent change information to be collected for the renter who moved between October 1977 and October 1978.

- 3(a) To examine tenants' perceptions of current quality of maintenance and services provided by the landlord.
- 3(b) To examine tenants' perceptions regarding the change in quality of maintenance and services over the past year. Once again this information was collected for the non-movers only.

The October 1978 Rental Market Survey represents the first real replication of this survey. As such, it provides the first opportunity to check the stability of the estimates provided by this type of telephone survey of renters. Further, survey replication allows a comparison of results of the 1978 Survey with those of the 1977 Survey.

This report is an analysis of certain data collected in the October 1978 Survey and provides selected comparisons between the 1977 and 1978 Rental Market Surveys. The analysis in this report is that of the Policy and Program Development Secretariat and not that of the consultant.

Each of the three sections of this report - rent increases, rent levels, and maintenance and services -

include some comparisons with the 1977 Survey results. The technical appendix provides additional information on the survey design and on survey errors.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The major findings of the October, 1978 Rental Market Survey are as follows:

I. Rent Increases

- Average rent increases in 1978, for tenants occupying the same unit over a one year period, ranged from a low of 4.6 percent in Sudbury to a high of 6.8 percent in both Ottawa and Metro Toronto (Table 1.4).
- A large number of renters, from 20 percent in Metro Toronto to 55 percent in Sudbury, received no rent increase from October, 1977 to October 1978. Substantially, more renters in small structures (less than 6 units) received no rent increase compared to those in large structures (Table 1.3).
- Average rent increases of 15 percent or more occurred in less than 8 percent of cases in all cities (Table 1.5).
- Substantial numbers of respondents, from 33 percent in Metro Toronto to 55 percent in Kingston, occupied different units between October, 1977 and October 1978 (Table 1.1).

- In all cities, the average percentage rent increase over the period October, 1977 to October, 1978 has declined from the average percentage increase over the period September, 1976 to September, 1977 (Table 1.10).

### III. Rent Levels

- Average rents, including separate charges, for one bedroom units ranged from \$176 per month in Sudbury to \$239 per month in Metro Toronto (Table 2.1).
- There is no evidence that average rents in all surveyed cities are consistently higher or lower according to the number of units in the building (Table 2.4).
- The annualized percentage change between the average September, 1977 rent and average October, 1978 rent varies from a low of 5.5 percent in Sudbury to a high of 12.3 percent in Kingston (Table 2.6).

### III. Maintenance and Services

- A majority of tenants in all cities perceived the level of maintenance and services to be good or very good, and over four-fifths

perceived the level to be adequate or better than adequate (Table 3.1).

- Most tenants, who were in the same unit from October, 1977 to October, 1978, believed the level of maintenance and services to be unchanged over that period of time. Of those who perceived a change, more believed that the level had improved (Table 3.4).

## I. RENT INCREASES

### October, 1978 Survey Results

The percentage increase in rents, including all separately charged services, was calculated from information given by tenants on their rent in October, 1978 and in October, 1977. It follows from this procedure that the rent increases reported are for those tenants who occupied the same unit for one year or more.

Table 1.1 indicates that substantial numbers of respondents, from 33 percent in Metro Toronto to 55 percent in Kingston, occupied different units between October, 1977 and October, 1978. Table 1.2 indicates that rental stock occupied by the non-mover is evenly distributed by size of structure. Hence, the rent increase data (i.e., non-movers) are not biased by a disproportionate number of smaller or larger buildings being excluded from the calculations. This is important since the percentage rent increase varies by the size of the structure containing the rental unit (see Table 1.6).

The rent increase data includes both those going through Rent Review and those who did not, and data are available for both those who received a rent increase between October, 1977 and October, 1978 and those who did not.

For those who rented the same unit in October, 1978 and October, 1977, Table 1.3 indicates the percentage who received no rent increase. It is apparent that substantial numbers of renters, especially in the northern communities, did not experience an increase in rent over the survey period. Table 1.3 further shows that substantially more renters in small structures (less than 6 units) received no rent increase compared to those in large structures (6 units or over).

Given the large number of cases with no rent changes and large number receiving increases in the five to ten percent range, average rent increases should be viewed somewhat cautiously. In Ottawa, for example, the average of all rent increases was 6.8 percent. This is, in fact, the combination of the 21 percent whose rent remained constant and the 79 percent who received increases averaging 8.5 percent. The 6.8 percent figure, in such cases, does not indicate a typical increase.

In such cases, the median increase may be regarded as a better indicator of typical experience. The median refers to the increase that has one-half of all increases both above and below it. As such, it is the mid-point of the distribution of rent increases.

a) Average Percentage Rent Increases

In Table 1.4, both average and median percentage rent increases are reported. The average percentage rent increase, for all those renting the same unit, ranged from a low of 4.6 percent in Sudbury to a high of 6.8 percent in Ottawa and in Metro Toronto. The median rent increase for these units ranged between zero percent in Sudbury to 6.0 percent in Ottawa.

If those whose rents remained unchanged were excluded, the average percentage rent increase ranged between 8.0 percent in Hamilton to 10.1 percent in Sudbury, while the median rent increase on these same units fell in the narrow range between 6.0 percent in London and 7.6 percent in Sudbury.

b) Percentage Rent Increase Distribution

The distribution of percentage rent increases shown in Table 1.5 indicates that 70 percent or more of renters (non-movers) in all cities experienced rent increases of 7.5 percent or less. In addition, increases of 15 percent or more occurred in less than 8 percent of all cases in all cities. It should be remembered that those on multi-year leases that did not expire during the period October, 1977 to October, 1978 would have a zero percentage rent increase, while those on multi-year leases

that did expire during this period would be expected to have higher than average rent increases. The survey design will not measure a rent increase occurring outside the 12-month survey period (October, 1977 - October, 1978).

Table 1.6 provides the percentage rent increase distribution by small (less than 6 units) and large structures (6 units and over). The major difference appears to be the relatively higher proportion of cases experiencing zero rent increases for small structures. It is plausible that the landlords of rental units in small structures (townhouses, single family units) may have a less regular pattern of rent increases.

Table 1.7 indicates that there are no real differences in the distribution of percentage rent increases experienced by those reporting income of under \$15,000 and those reporting incomes of \$15,000 and over.

#### Comparisons of Rent Increase Results from 1978 and 1977 Rental Market Surveys

As indicated previously, the 1978 Survey was essentially a replication of the 1977 Survey. Therefore, some results given previously in this section for the 1978 Survey can be compared to the results of the 1977 Survey.

Comparisons are made to find evidence for any change over the period. Secondly, these comparisons provide indications that Rental Market Surveys have been consistently and reliably measuring various phenomena such as:

- i) Occurrences of substantial numbers of no rent increase cases.
- ii) Occurrences of substantial numbers of tenants seeking and successfully renting new accommodation.

a) Renter Mobility

Table 1.8 illustrates the fact that substantial numbers of tenants continued to move to new accommodations during the October, 1977 - October, 1978 period (33% in Metro Toronto to 55% in Kingston) as they did during the September, 1976 - September, 1977 period (38% in Sault Ste. Marie to 55% in London). There has been no real decline in the renter mobility over the period September, 1976 to October, 1978.

b) Zero Rent Increase Cases

The 1977 Survey showed that a large number of renters (who did not move between September, 1976 and September, 1977) experienced no rent increase during the year (21% in Metro Toronto to 48% in Sault Ste. Marie). The 1978 Survey revealed very similar results

(see Table 1.9). In fact, some cities, such as Sudbury, show an apparent increase in the proportion of zero rent increase cases. [Sudbury 43% (1977) to 55% (1978)]

c) Tenants with Rent Increases of More than Ten Percent

Table 1.9 indicates that in all the eight cities, the proportion of tenants (non-movers) facing rent increases of more than 10 percent has declined from 1977 to 1978: Kingston, 12 percent to 11 percent; London 17 percent to 11 percent, Sault Ste. Marie 13 percent to 11 percent, Sudbury 20 percent to 14 percent, and Thunder Bay 16 percent to 11 percent.

Similar declines have also been observed in Metro Toronto, Ottawa and Hamilton. As indicated in the following table, the decline in these three cities is statistically significant (i.e., the difference between 1977 and 1978 have passed statistical tests to prove that they are greater than could have been caused by sampling error). The samples in these three cities are large enough to permit such statistical testings.

PROPORTION OF TENANTS REPORTING RENT  
INCREASES OF MORE THAN 10 PERCENT

	1977 Survey September 76- September 77 (%)	1978 Survey October 77- October 78 (%)	Differences (%)
Metro Toronto	21	16	5*
Ottawa	23	14	9*
Hamilton	16	11	5*

\*These differences are statistically significant at the 5% significance level, i.e., there is only one chance in 20 that the difference is due to sampling errors.

d) Average Percentage Rent Increases

In Table 1.10, the average percentage rent increases for non-movers from the 1978 and 1977 Surveys are presented. In all cities the averages have declined from 1977 to 1978. For example, in Sudbury, the average increase fell from 6.8 percent in 1977 to 4.6 percent in 1978. If zero rent increase cases are included, the decrease is smaller: Sudbury 11.7 percent in 1977 to 10.1 percent in 1978.

TABLE 1.1

RENTER MOBILITY DURING THE PERIOD  
OCTOBER 1977 TO OCTOBER 1978

14

Municipality	NON-MOVERS						Sample Size (%)	
	MOVED		Lived in Same City but did not rent Oct '77*		Lived in Different City Oct '77**			
	Rented Same Unit	Different Unit	Within Same City	Oct '77*	Total	(%)		
Metro Toronto	67	18	7	8	100	1,177		
Ottawa	60	17	9	15	100	1,065		
Hamilton	63	15	9	13	100	1,097		
Kingston	45	27	9	19	100	390		
London	51	24	10	16	100	439		
Sault Ste. Marie	55	16	17	12	100	401		
Sudbury	60	20	9	11	100	403		
Thunder Bay	54	19	13	15	100	404		

\*Mostly new households and changes in tenure from home ownership.

\*\*These are in-migrant households and note that the above table does not take into account out-migrants.

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 1.2PERCENTAGE OF NON-MOVERS BY BUILDING SIZE  
OCTOBER, 1977 - OCTOBER, 1978

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Apartment</u>	<u>Structure</u>	<u>Non Apt. *</u>	<u>All</u>
	<u>6 Units or More</u> (%)	<u>Less Than 6 Units</u> (%)	<u>Structure</u> (%)	<u>Structures</u> (%)
Metro Toronto	68.1	64.2	67.0	67.4
Ottawa	58.1	57.1	64.2	59.8
Hamilton	64.7	57.8	60.0	62.9
Kingston	43.6	48.9	43.7	44.9
London	54.2	43.1	51.0	51.3
Sault Ste. Marie	56.7	51.6	56.7	55.1
Sudbury	57.1	55.3	64.7	59.8
Thunder Bay	56.6	55.8	49.6	54.0

\* Non Apartment Structures includes all single family, duplex, row and townhouse units.

TABLE 1.3

PERCENTAGE OF THOSE RENTING SAME UNIT  
WITH ZERO RENT INCREASE BY BUILDING SIZE

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Six Units or More</u> (%)	<u>Less Than Six Units*</u> (%)	<u>All Units</u> (%)
Metro Toronto	8.8	45.5	20.0
Ottawa	11.6	30.3	20.5
Hamilton	12.7	48.0	24.2
Kingston	21.9	48.0	37.0
London	20.2	40.4	29.8
Sault Ste. Marie	16.7	60.7	45.0
Sudbury	30.1	65.6	54.7
Thunder Bay	17.3	49.6	37.4

\* Less than 6 units include apt. structures with less than 6 units, single family, duplex, row and townhouse

TABLE 1.4

AVERAGE AND MEDIAN PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE\* (NON-MOVERS)  
OCTOBER, 1977 - OCTOBER, 1978

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Cases Where Rent Increase Greater than 0%</u>	<u>Rent Increases All Units **</u>
Metro Toronto	8.5 (6.3) ***	6.8 (5.9)
Ottawa	8.5 (6.2)	6.8 (6.0)
Hamilton	8.0 (6.1)	6.1 (5.8)
Kingston	9.2 (6.4)	5.8 (5.4)
London	8.6 (6.0)	6.0 (5.7)
Sault Ste. Marie	9.7 (6.2)	5.3 (1.2)
Sudbury	10.1 (7.6)	4.6 (0.0)
Thunder Bay	8.5 (6.5)	5.4 (5.4)

\* All rent change calculations exclude renters who did not reside in the same unit Oct. 1977 and Oct. 1978.

\*\* In each city a proportion of renters reported no change in rent between Oct. 1977 and Oct. 1978.

\*\*\* Medians in brackets

TABLE 1.5

## DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)

Municipality	Zero (%)	0.1-5.0 (%)	5.1-7.5 (%)	7.51-10.0 (%)	10.1-15.0 (%)	15.1-20 (%)	Over 20.0 (%)	Total (%)	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	20.0	13.0	38.1	12.9	9.1	3.1	3.8	100	767
Ottawa	20.5	14.4	40.0	11.5	7.8	2.9	2.9	100	626
Hamilton	24.2	15.6	38.3	10.8	7.1	2.1	2.1	100	675
Kingston	37.0	11.0	28.9	12.1	3.5	2.9	4.6	100	173
London	29.8	10.1	39.0	10.1	6.4	1.4	3.2	100	218
Sault Ste. Marie	45.0	10.1	24.5	10.2	6.4	1.4	2.8	100	218
Sudbury	54.7	5.9	17.0	8.5	6.8	3.8	3.4	100	236
Thunder Bay	37.4	10.3	30.0	11.7	5.6	2.3	2.8	100	214

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 1.6

 PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)  
 BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	Zero (%)	-5.0 (%)	0.1 (%)	5.1 (%)	-7.5 (%)	7.51 (%)	-10.0 (%)	10.1 (%)	-15 (%)	15.1 (%)	-20 (%)	Over 20 (%)	Total (%)	Average Increase (%)	Sample Size	
														(%)	(%)	
Metro Toronto	-Less than 6 units	45.5	9.4	20.6	11.6	6.4	2.2	4.3	100	5.2	233					
	-6 units or more	8.8	14.6	45.7	13.5	10.3	3.6	3.6	100	7.5	534					
Ottawa	-Less than 6 units	30.3	11.8	33.3	11.8	5.7	2.7	4.4	100	6.6	297					
	-6 units or more	11.6	16.7	46.0	11.3	9.7	3.0	1.5	100	7.0	329					
Hamilton	-Less than 6 units	48.0	10.5	22.0	10.1	3.2	1.8	4.6	100	5.0	219					
	-6 units or more	12.7	18.0	46.1	11.2	9.0	2.2	0.9	100	6.6	456					
Kingston	-Less than 6 units	48.0	13.0	23.0	7.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	100	4.9	100					
	-6 units or more	21.9	8.2	37.0	19.2	2.7	4.1	6.9	100	7.0	73					
London	-Less than 6 units	40.4	8.7	31.7	7.7	1.9	2.9	6.7	100	6.7	104					
	-6 units or more	20.2	11.4	45.6	12.3	10.5	0.0	0.0	100	5.4	114					
Sault Ste. Marie	-Less than 6 units	60.7	5.7	15.9	7.3	5.7	2.1	2.9	100	4.9	140					
	-6 units or more	16.7	18.0	39.7	15.4	7.7	0.0	2.6	100	6.0	78					
Sudbury	-Less than 6 units	65.6	4.3	11.7	6.1	4.9	4.3	3.1	100	3.9	163					
	-6 units or more	30.1	9.6	28.8	13.7	11.0	2.7	4.1	100	6.1	73					
Thunder Bay	-Less than 6 units	49.6	6.0	18.8	11.3	7.5	3.0	3.8	100	5.3	133					
	-6 units or more	17.3	17.3	48.2	12.4	2.5	1.2	1.2	100	5.5	81					

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors  
 for these distributions. Percentages may  
 not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 1.7  
PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)  
BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Municipality	Zero	0.1			5.1			10.0			15.1			Total	Sample Size
		-5.0	(%)	-7.5	(%)	-10.0	(%)	-15.0	(%)	-20.0	(%)	-20.0	(%)		
Metro Toronto	- Less than \$15,000	20.7	13.0	37.9	12.4	8.3	2.7	5.0	100	100	338				
	- \$15,000 and over	19.4	13.1	38.2	13.3	9.8	3.5	2.8	100	100	429				
Ottawa	- Less than \$15,000	22.9	15.2	39.2	11.6	6.6	1.7	2.7	100	100	302				
	- \$15,000 and over	18.2	13.6	40.7	11.4	9.0	4.0	3.1	100	100	324				
Hamilton	- Less than \$15,000	26.6	15.3	38.8	8.6	5.9	1.8	3.2	100	100	339				
	- \$15,000 and over	21.7	15.8	37.8	13.1	8.3	2.4	0.9	100	100	336				
Kingston	- Less than \$15,000	38.5	12.5	27.1	9.4	3.1	4.2	5.2	100	100	96				
	- \$15,000 and over	35.1	9.1	31.2	15.6	3.9	1.3	3.9	100	100	77				
London	- Less than \$15,000	27.3	12.4	41.3	8.3	5.8	0.8	4.1	100	100	121				
	- \$15,000 and over	33.0	7.2	36.1	12.4	7.2	2.1	2.1	100	100	97				
Sault Ste. Marie	- Less than \$15,000	46.0	9.7	22.3	8.0	8.9	2.7	2.7	100	100	113				
	- \$15,000 and over	43.8	10.5	26.9	12.5	3.8	0.0	2.9	100	100	105				
Sudbury	- Less than \$15,000	58.8	5.3	15.8	7.9	6.1	2.6	3.5	100	100	114				
	- \$15,000 and over	50.8	6.6	18.0	9.0	7.4	4.9	3.3	100	100	122				
Thunder Bay	- Less than \$15,000	35.4	13.1	33.9	9.2	4.6	1.5	2.3	100	100	130				
	- \$15,000 and over	40.5	6.0	23.8	15.5	7.1	3.6	3.6	100	100	84				

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors  
for these distributions. Percentages may  
not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 1.8

PERCENTAGE RENTING SAME UNIT/DIFFERENT UNIT  
(1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	October 1977 to October 1978		September 1976 to September 1977	
	Same Unit (%)	Different Unit (%)	Same Unit (%)	Different Unit (%)
Metro Toronto	67	33	59	41
Ottawa	60	40	57	43
Hamilton	63	37	60	40
Kingston	45	55	50	50
London	51	49	45	55
Sault Ste. Marie	55	45	62	38
Sudbury	60	40	61	39
Thunder Bay	54	46	56	44

TABLE 1.9

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)  
(1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	0.1		5.1		10.1		15.1		Total (%)	Sample Size
	zero (%)	-5.0 (%)	-10.0 (%)	-15.0 (%)	-20.0 (%)	-20.0 (%)				
Metro Toronto	- 1977*	21.4	9.4	48.1	10.8	4.8	5.5	100	620	767
	- 1978**	20.0	13.0	50.9	9.1	3.1	3.8	100	626	
Ottawa	- 1977	24.9	10.7	41.5	12.5	5.3	5.1	100	626	626
	- 1978	20.5	14.4	51.6	7.8	2.9	2.9	100	626	
Hamilton	- 1977	25.6	10.9	47.4	10.6	2.4	3.1	100	622	675
	- 1978	24.2	15.6	49.0	7.1	2.1	2.1	100	675	
Kingston	- 1977	35.7	7.4	44.9	6.5	2.3	3.2	100	216	173
	- 1978	37.0	11.0	41.0	3.5	2.9	4.6	100	173	
London	- 1977	26.0	6.1	50.8	9.9	2.2	5.0	100	181	218
	- 1978	29.8	10.1	49.1	6.4	1.4	3.2	100	218	
Sault Ste. Marie	- 1977	47.9	8.0	31.1	8.7	1.1	3.2	100	286	218
	- 1978	45.0	10.1	34.4	6.4	1.4	2.8	100	218	
Sudbury	- 1977	43.4	6.2	30.3	7.0	7.8	5.3	100	244	236
	- 1978	54.7	5.9	25.5	6.8	3.8	3.4	100	236	
Thunder Bay	- 1977	35.4	6.2	42.6	5.2	5.2	5.5	100	291	214
	- 1978	37.4	10.3	41.6	5.6	2.3	2.8	100	214	

\* All rent change calculations exclude renters who did not reside in the same unit Sept. 1976 and Sept. 1977. In each city a proportion of renters reported no change in rents between Sept. 1976 and Sept. 1977.

\*\* All rent change calculations exclude renters who did not reside in the same unit Oct. 1977 and Oct. 1978. In each city a proportion of renters reported no change in rents between Oct. 1977 and Oct. 1978.

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 1.10

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)  
(1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>October 1977 to October 1978</u>		<u>September 1976 to September 1977</u>	
	Cases Where Rent Increase Greater than 0% *	(%)	Cases Where Rent Increase Greater than 0% ***	(%)
Metro Toronto	8.5	6.8	10.9	8.6
Ottawa	8.5	6.8	10.9	8.3
Hamilton	8.0	6.1	9.2	6.9
Kingston	9.2	5.8	9.4	6.1
London	8.6	6.0	10.6	8.0
Sault Ste. Marie	9.7	5.3	10.1	5.3
Sudbury	10.1	4.6	11.7	6.8
Thunder Bay	8.5	5.4	10.3	6.7

- \* All rent change calculations exclude renters who did not reside in the same unit Oct. 1977 and Oct. 1978.
- \*\* In Each city a proportion of renters reported no change in rent between Oct. 1977 and Oct. 1978.
- \*\*\* All rent change calculations exclude renters who did not reside in the same unit Sept. 1976 and Sept. 1977.
- \*\*\*\* In each city a proportion of renters reported no change in rent between Sept. 1976 and Sept. 1977.

## II. RENT LEVELS

### October, 1978 Survey Results

As one might expect, rent levels were shown to vary widely across the Province. Table 2.1 indicates that the average rent, including separate charges, on one-bedroom units ranged from \$176 a month in Sudbury to \$239 a month in Metro Toronto. Table 2.2 contrasts the overall rent distribution for all bedroom sizes in the eight cities.

Rent distributions for one, two and three bedroom units for each surveyed city are given in Table 2.3 (Metro Toronto and Ottawa), Table 2.3A (Hamilton and Kingston), Table 2.3B (London and Sault Ste. Marie) and Table 2.3C (Sudbury and Thunder Bay).

In making any inter-city comparisions, it should be kept in mind that the quality of the average unit may differ from city to city. It also should be remembered that the higher rents of certain cities reflects the greater market value of the location and as such would not necessarily indicate the existence of a market imbalance.

Table 2.4 compares rent distributions within each city by building size. The rent distributions for large and small buildings are somewhat similar, and there is no evidence that average rents in all surveyed cities are consistently higher or lower according to the number of units in the building.

Data were also collected on the amount of separate charges paid by the tenant to the landlord. Such charges existed in only a minority of cases in all cities, and in less than one case in ten in areas other than the three largest cities (see Table 2.5). Such charges were under \$30 a month in virtually all cases.

#### Comparison of Rent Levels from 1978 and 1977 Rental Market Surveys

As explained previously, the 1978 Survey was a replication of the 1977 Survey. Therefore information on rent levels from the two surveys may be compared to identify differences. However, an important caveat when comparing the two surveys is that the 1978 Survey was conducted in October. Thus the 1978 Survey should not be regarded as a complete replication of the 1977 Survey. Further, most replication of surveys fail to implement

identical field procedures, in fact some rather minor modifications were made to the 1978 Survey questionnaire (e.g., to validate renter mobility information).

a) Average Rents, October 1978 and September 1977

Table 2.6 compares average rents for October 1978 and September 1977 by unit size in the eight surveyed cities. As expected, in all cities the average rents have increased for all unit sizes. Also, the annualized percentage change in average October 1978 and average September 1977 rent has been calculated in Table 2.6.

Table 2.6 shows that the annualized percentage change between the two average rents for all units varies considerably among cities (5.5% in Sudbury to 12.3% in Kingston), and also within city by unit size (Metro Toronto 7.1% (1 bedroom unit), 10.1% (2 bedroom unit), 10.8% (3 bedroom unit), and 10.1% (all units)).

The percentage changes quoted above refer to all rental stock and not just where the tenant rented the same unit for a period of 12 months (October, 1977 to October, 1978 for the 1978 Survey) as is the case for the rent increase calculations presented in Section I of this report.

Table 2.7 illustrates the percentage rent increase for non-movers from the 1978 Survey, and the annualized percentage change in average rents from September, 1977 to October, 1978 (from the 1978 and 1977 Surveys). In Metro Toronto, for example, non-movers faced an average percentage rent increase of 6.8% (all non-mover cases) and 8.5% (zero rent increase cases excluded) in contrast to a 10.1% change in average rents from September, 1977 to October, 1978. The 10.1% change in this case should not be interpreted as the "percentage rent increase" faced by movers and non-movers. The interpretation of the statistic 10.1% is rather complex as is explained below.

b) Interpretation of "Annualized Percentage Change in Averages"

For non-movers, data on individual rents for October, 1977 and for October, 1978 are possible to collect and the calculation "percentage rent increase" is straight forward. For movers, data on individual rents have been collected for October 1978 only, but it is not possible to calculate the "percentage rent increase" for this group of renters. However, for total stock (utilized by movers and non-movers) it is possible to obtain average rents for September, 1977 (1977 Survey) and for October, 1978 (1978 Survey)

and then calculate "annualized percentage change in averages". In the use of the statistic "annualized percentage change in averages" the following points should be noted:

- Between September, 1977 and October, 1978 the rental stock has changed through addition of higher priced units (new construction) and removal of lower priced units (demolition). Therefore, the "percentage change in average" statistic, which is dependent on changes to rental stock, would tend to be higher than the actual increases experienced by renters in the same rental stock.
- Since the time between the two surveys is 13 months, the "percentage change in average" statistic is annualized for comparison with the percentage rent increase statistic calculated for non-movers over a 12 month period. Thus the two measures cover slightly different periods.

- Averages of any variable are very susceptible to extreme values (i.e. very small values or very large values). In the case of the "percentage change in average" statistic, the 1978 average would be unduly affected by the higher priced new units being rented between September, 1977 and October, 1978.
- Average rents obtained from sample surveys are subject to sampling errors. Example: Metro-Toronto - the 1978 average rent of \$273 actually lies between \$267.40 and \$278.60, while the 1977 average rent of \$246 actually lies between \$241.20 and \$250.80. Hence, the difference of \$27 between \$273 and \$246 actually lies between \$19.70 and \$34.60. (All intervals are at 95% confidence level).

From the above arguments it should be clear that to interpret "annualized percentage change in averages" as "percentage rent increase" for both non-movers and movers is conceptually incorrect. Further, the survey design does not permit an estimate for percentage rent increases for movers. It is, however, of interest to note that in some cities the "percentage rent increases" reported for non-movers are only slightly lower than the reported "annualized percentage change in average rents" for total rental stock.

Table 2.8 presents rent distributions for October, 1978 and September, 1977. As expected, the 1978 rent distribution reflects rent increases which occurred in 1978. This was discussed more fully in Section I.

TABLE 2.1

OCTOBER 1978 AVERAGE RENTS  
BY UNIT SIZE

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>1 Bedroom</u> (\$)	<u>2 Bedroom</u> (\$)	<u>3 Bedroom</u> (\$)	<u>All Units</u> (\$)
Metro Toronto	239	293	343	273 ± 5.6**
Ottawa	227	275	302	259
Hamilton	190	235	270	224
Kingston	185	216	*	229
London	193	227	*	223
Sault Ste. Marie	187	230	*	214
Sudbury	176	190	*	196
Thunder Bay	203	252	*	236

\* No estimates calculated due to small sample size

\*\* The chances are about 95 out of 100 (95%) that the true average rent for Metro Toronto lies between \$267.40 and \$278.60. For standard errors for other cities please refer to Table 4.3

TABLE 2.2OCTOBER 1978 RENT DISTRIBUTION  
(ALL UNITS)

Municipality	\$1-150			\$151-200			\$201-250			\$251-300			\$301-400			Over \$400			Total (%)	Sample Size
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		
Metro Toronto	4.9	13.3	26.4																100	1,177
Ottawa	6.9	17.7	26.6																100	1,065
Hamilton	11.0	29.4	32.6																100	1,097
Kingston	17.9	28.3	26.3																100	392
London	7.7	31.9	33.9																100	439
Sault Ste. Marie	15.7	30.4	27.9																100	401
Sudbury	28.3	31.8	21.1																100	403
Thunder Bay	13.1	23.8	26.7																100	404

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.3

## DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY UNIT SIZE

October 1978 Rent	Metro Toronto			Ottawa		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
\$ 1 - 175	10.5	2.7	2.1	14.5	6.0	5.9
\$176 - 200	11.2	5.3	6.9	15.9	8.2	8.5
\$201 - 225	20.1	4.2	2.8	17.3	11.4	4.3
\$226 - 250	21.7	13.1	5.5	20.6	12.5	11.2
\$251 - 275	17.7	18.7	6.9	17.3	14.1	8.0
\$276 - 300	7.4	22.0	13.1	8.6	17.9	16.0
\$301 - 350	9.2	19.6	20.0	5.6	18.2	23.9
\$351 - 400	1.8	7.3	21.4	0.3	7.3	13.3
\$401+	0.5	7.1	21.4	0.0	4.3	9.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	447	450	145	359	368	188

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors  
 for these distributions. Percentages may  
 not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.3A  
DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY UNIT SIZE

October 1978 Rent	Hamilton			Kingston		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
\$ 1 - 150	15.8	4.6	4.0	26.2	11.5	14.9
\$151 - 175	15.3	6.1	6.3	16.8	11.5	4.5
\$176 - 200	33.1	15.4	5.7	25.2	16.6	16.4
\$201 - 225	20.9	18.2	6.9	16.8	13.4	3.0
\$226 - 250	10.3	23.9	14.9	11.2	22.3	14.9
\$251 - 275	1.8	15.4	10.9	2.8	14.0	16.4
\$276 - 300	2.6	7.5	22.9	0.0	7.0	9.0
\$301 - 350	0.3	7.0	21.4	0.0	3.8	11.9
\$351+	0.0	2.0	7.4	0.9	0.0	9.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	387	456	175	107	157	67

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.3B

## DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY UNIT SIZE

	London			Sault Ste. Marie		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
\$ 1 - 150	9.8	2.2	7.8	22.7	7.7	11.1
\$151 - 175	23.5	11.4	1.3	14.2	8.9	6.4
\$176 - 200	27.3	16.3	10.4	29.8	10.7	14.3
\$201 - 225	20.5	20.7	11.7	10.6	14.9	4.8
\$226 - 250	13.6	24.5	6.5	14.9	23.2	9.5
\$251 - 275	3.8	12.0	10.4	7.1	14.3	9.5
\$276 - 300	1.5	8.7	22.1	0.7	19.1	14.3
\$301 - 350	0.0	4.4	27.3	0.0	1.2	28.6
\$351+	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	132	184	77	141	168	63

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
 Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.3C

## DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY UNIT SIZE

October 1978 Rent	Sudbury			Thunder Bay		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
\$ 1 - 100	6.9	7.6	4.6	6.4	2.6	1.6
\$101 - 150	33.7	17.0	10.2	8.5	4.5	3.1
\$151 - 175	14.9	16.4	5.7	17.7	6.5	4.7
\$176 - 200	12.9	23.4	15.9	17.0	11.6	6.3
\$201 - 225	12.9	12.3	11.4	14.9	12.9	3.1
\$226 - 250	7.9	11.1	12.5	21.3	14.8	9.4
\$251 - 275	8.9	5.3	11.4	8.5	16.1	6.3
\$276 - 300	2.0	4.1	13.6	1.4	12.3	10.9
\$301 - 350	0.0	2.3	9.1	4.3	10.3	29.7
\$351+	0.0	0.6	5.7	0.0	8.4	25.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	101	171	88	141	155	64

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
 Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.4

OCTOBER 1978 RENT DISTRIBUTION  
BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	\$1			\$201			\$301			Over \$400			Total (%)	Avg. Rent (\$)	Sample Size
	-\$100 (%)	-\$100 (%)	-\$100 (%)	-\$250 (%)	-\$250 (%)	-\$250 (%)	-\$400 (%)	-\$400 (%)	-\$400 (%)	-\$400 (%)	-\$400 (%)	-\$400 (%)			
Metro Toronto	-	Less than 6 units	3.5	9.0	22.3	20.9	16.3	16.9	10.9	100	267	368			
	-	6 units or more	0.3	1.2	9.0	28.9	33.9	21.6	5.1	100	276	809			
Ottawa	-	Less than 6 units	4.2	7.9	20.4	19.8	19.1	22.9	5.8	100	259	481			
	-	6 units or more	0.2	2.6	15.4	32.2	30.3	15.9	3.4	100	258	584			
Hamilton	-	Less than 6 units	5.8	17.5	23.9	19.1	18.8	11.9	2.9	100	224	377			
	-	6 units or more	0.1	4.4	32.2	39.7	16.3	6.8	0.4	100	224	720			
Kingston	-	Less than 6 units	8.2	15.5	29.1	17.3	11.4	8.6	10.0	100	236	220			
	-	6 units or more	1.7	8.7	27.3	37.8	18.6	5.2	0.6	100	219	172			
London	-	Less than 6 units	2.7	9.9	30.0	22.4	19.7	14.8	0.5	100	228	223			
	-	6 units or more	0.5	2.3	33.8	45.8	14.8	2.8	0.0	100	218	216			
Sault Ste. Marie	-	Less than 6 units	5.8	16.2	38.1	23.5	11.2	5.4	0.0	100	200	260			
	-	6 units or more	1.4	2.8	16.3	36.2	38.3	5.0	0.0	100	240	141			
Sudbury	-	Less than 6 units	10.7	25.6	32.6	15.2	10.4	5.2	0.4	100	184	270			
	-	6 units or more	0.8	11.3	30.1	33.1	19.6	5.3	0.0	100	218	133			
Thunder Bay	-	Less than 6 units	7.7	9.3	29.0	21.2	13.9	3.1	100	230	259				
	-	6 units or more	2.8	3.5	14.5	36.6	23.5	15.9	3.5	100	247	145			

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors  
for these distributions. Percentages may  
not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.5

## DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE CHARGES

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>No Separate Charges</u>		<u>\$1-10</u>		<u>\$11-30</u>		<u>\$31+</u>		<u>Total</u> (%)	<u>Sample Size</u> (%)
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		
Metro Toronto	66.7	8.2		23.6		1.6		100	1,176	
Ottawa	74.3	7.0		17.0		1.7		100	1,065	
Hamilton	76.6	13.1		9.7		0.6		100	1,097	
Kingston	94.4	4.9		0.5		0.3		100	392	
London	94.1	4.1		1.4		0.5		100	439	
Sault Ste. Marie	96.0	3.0		0.5		0.5		100	401	
Sudbury	90.8	5.5		3.5		0.3		100	403	
Thunder Bay	92.3	3.5		3.5		0.7		100	404	

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2.6

ANNUALIZED PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN AVERAGE OCTOBER 1978 RENT  
AND AVERAGE SEPTEMBER 1977 RENT FOR TOTAL RENTAL STOCK  
(1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	1 BEDROOM			2 BEDROOM			3 BEDROOM			ALL UNITS		
	Avg. Rent Sept. 1977 (\$)	Avg. Annualized Oct. 1978 Change (\$)	Avg. Annualized Oct. 1977 Change (\$)	Avg. Rent Sept. 1977 (\$)	Avg. Annualized Oct. 1978 Change (\$)	Avg. Rent Sept. 1977 (\$)	Avg. Annualized Oct. 1978 Change (\$)	Avg. Rent Sept. 1977 (\$)	Avg. Annualized Oct. 1978 Change (\$)	Avg. Rent Sept. 1977 (\$)	Avg. Annualized Oct. 1978 Change (\$)	
Metro Toronto	222	239	+7.1	264	293	+10.1	307	\$343	+10.8	246	273	+10.1
Ottawa	214	227	+5.6	251	275	+ 8.8	281	\$302	+ 6.9	243	259	+ 6.1
Hamilton	179	190	+5.7	215	235	+ 8.6	253	\$270	+ 6.2	206	224	+ 8.1
Kingston	176	185	+4.7	207	216	+ 4.0	*	*	*	202	229	+12.3
London	184	193	+4.5	216	227	+ 4.7	*	*	*	208	223	+ 6.7
Sault Ste. Marie	175	187	+6.3	198	230	+14.9	*	*	*	194	214	+ 9.5
Sudbury	171	176	+2.7	182	190	+ 4.1	*	*	*	185	196	+ 5.5
Thunder Bay	186	203	+8.4	226	252	+10.6	*	*	*	212	236	+10.4

\* No estimates calculated due to small sample size.

TABLE 2.7

EXAMINATION OF PERCENTAGE RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)  
 AND ANNUALIZED PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN AVERAGE RENTS  
 (SEPTEMBER 1977, OCTOBER 1978 FOR ALL UNITS)

Municipality	Avg. Rent Sept./77 (\$)	Avg. Rent Oct./78 (\$)	Average Percentage Rent Increase		
			Non Movers (Oct. 1977- Oct. 1978)		Rent Increase All Units (%)
			Annualized Percentage Change (%)	Rent Increase Greater than -0% (%)	
Metro Toronto	246	273	+10.1	8.5	6.8
Ottawa	243	259	+ 6.1	8.5	6.8
Hamilton	206	224	+ 8.1	8.0	6.1
Kingston	202	229	+12.3	9.2	5.8
London	208	223	+ 6.7	8.6	6.0
Sault Ste. Marie	194	214	+ 9.5	9.7	5.3
Sudbury	185	196	+ 5.5	10.1	4.6
Thunder Bay	212	236	+10.4	8.5	5.4

TABLE 2.8

RENT LEVEL DISTRIBUTION  
SEPTEMBER 1977, OCTOBER 1978  
(1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	\$1- 150 (%)		\$151- 200 (%)		\$201- 250 (%)		\$251- 300 (%)		Over -300 (%)		Total (%)	Sample Size
	Sept.	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.		
Metro Toronto	-	Sept. 1977	8.0	19.1	33.8	22.3	16.8	100			1,054	
	-	Oct. 1978	4.9	13.3	26.4	28.4	27.0	100			1,177	
Ottawa	-	Sept. 1977	9.3	22.1	29.5	21.1	18.0	100			1,102	
	-	Oct. 1978	6.9	17.7	26.6	25.3	23.6	100			1,065	
Hamilton	-	Sept. 1977	14.2	39.0	30.2	10.2	6.4	100			1,038	
	-	Oct. 1978	11.0	29.4	32.6	17.1	9.9	100			1,097	
Kingston	-	Sept. 1977	22.8	33.7	26.5	9.7	7.3	100			422	
	-	Oct. 1978	17.9	28.3	26.3	14.5	13.0	100			392	
London	-	Sept. 1977	16.2	35.7	28.6	13.3	6.2	100			406	
	-	Oct. 1978	7.7	31.9	33.9	17.3	9.1	100			439	
Sault Ste. Marie	-	Sept. 1977	25.5	30.5	31.2	10.6	2.2	100			455	
	-	Oct. 1978	15.7	30.4	27.9	20.7	5.2	100			401	
Sudbury	-	Sept. 1977	32.7	33.7	20.8	10.0	2.8	100			400	
	-	Oct. 1978	28.3	31.8	21.1	13.4	5.5	100			403	
Thunder Bay	-	Sept. 1977	23.9	24.7	25.5	15.7	10.2	100			522	
	-	Oct. 1978	13.1	23.8	26.7	17.3	19.0	100			404	

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors  
for these distributions. Percentages may  
not add to 100 due to rounding.

### III. MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES

#### October, 1978 Survey Results

##### a) Current Level of Maintenance and Services

A majority of tenants in all cities reported their level of maintenance and services as being good or very good. Over four-fifths of the tenants in all cities reported the level as being adequate or better than adequate (see Table 3.1). The pattern of satisfaction was generally similar in both larger buildings (six units and over) and small structures (see Table 3.2).

A comparison of tenants' satisfaction with their current level of maintenance and services by total annual family income (under \$15,000; \$15,000 and over) reveals no significant differences (see Table 3.3).

##### b) Change in Level of Maintenance and Services - 1977 to 1978

Most tenants who were in the same unit from October 1977 to October 1978 believed the level of maintenance and services to be unchanged over that period of time. Of those who believed the level of services had changed, relatively more believed that the level had improved (see Table 3.4). In all cities surveyed only a small percentage of tenants felt that the services were a lot worse over the period.

Once again the pattern of satisfaction was generally similar in both large (six units and over) and small structures (less than six units) (see Table 3.5).

Table 3.6 provides no clear evidence that perceived changes in level of maintenance and services differ according to the level of annual family income.

Comparison of Maintenance and Services Results from the 1978 and 1977 Rental Market Surveys

a) Current Quality of Maintenance and Services (1977, 1978 Surveys)

Table 3.7 provides the distribution of tenants' perception of the quality of maintenance and services from the 1978 and 1977 Surveys. No changes in tenants' perception over the two surveys are apparent. However, it is plausible that the tenant does not readily perceive the changed quality of maintenance and services, or that the survey question (given below) is unable to measure the change.

For all respondents:

Thinking about the quality of maintenance and services included in your rent -- such things might include landscaping, janitorial services, upkeep to the building exterior,

upkeep of your dwelling unit -- would you say the overall quality of maintenance and services is ... ?

Very good .....	1
Good .....	2
Adequate .....	3
Poor .....	4
or Very Poor .....	5

b) Change in Quality of Maintenance and Services (1977, 1978 Surveys)

Table 3.8 shows the distribution of perceived changes in maintenance and services from the 1978 and 1977 Surveys. Once again the distributions from the two surveys are similar, though in all cities there has been an apparent decline in the number of tenants reporting the change as "worse over the past year" (e.g., Metro Toronto 14.5% (1977) to 11.7% (1978), and Ottawa 11.4% (1977) to 9.3% (1978)).

Here again a soft question (given below) was asked of all respondents who had rented the same unit one year ago:

Over the past 12 months, would you say that the quality of maintenance and services included in your rent where you live ... ?

Has improved a lot .....	1
Has improved a little .....	2
Has not changed .....	3
Has become a little worse .....	4
Has become a lot worse .....	5

In Table 3.8 the category "Better" is the sum of "Has improved a lot" and "Has improved a little", and the category "Worse" is the sum of "Has become a little worse" and "Has become a lot worse".

TABLE 3.1

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Very Good</u> (%)	<u>Good</u> (%)	<u>Adequate</u> (%)	<u>Poor</u> (%)	<u>Very Poor</u> (%)	<u>Unstated</u> (%)	<u>Total</u> (%)	<u>Sample Size</u>
	Very Good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	Unstated	Total	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	29.3	26.9	24.6	11.4	7.0	0.8	100	1,177
Ottawa	29.2	31.4	24.4	9.5	4.2	1.3	100	1,065
Hamilton	27.8	32.2	23.9	9.2	5.8	1.1	100	1,097
Kingston	26.5	30.4	29.1	8.4	4.8	0.8	100	392
London	25.1	31.9	28.2	11.6	3.2	0.0	100	439
Sault Ste. Marie	31.7	34.7	21.9	7.5	3.5	0.7	100	401
Sudbury	34.0	34.2	21.6	7.4	2.5	0.3	100	403
Thunder Bay	28.0	36.9	22.5	6.4	5.2	1.0	100	404

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
 Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

TABLE 3.2

CURRENT QUALITY OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES BY BUILDING SIZE  
- TENANT PERCEPTION -

<u>Municipality</u>		<u>Very Good</u> (%)	<u>Good</u> (%)	<u>Adequate</u> (%)	<u>Poor</u> (%)	<u>Very Poor</u> (%)	<u>Unstated</u> (%)	<u>Total</u> (%)	<u>Sample Size</u>
Metro Toronto	- Less than 6 units	25.8	31.5	23.6	9.8	6.8	2.5	100	368
	- 6 units and more	30.9	24.9	25.0	12.1	7.1	0.1	100	809
Ottawa	- Less than 6 units	28.5	33.3	21.2	9.6	4.8	2.7	100	481
	- 6 units and more	29.8	29.8	27.1	9.4	3.8	0.2	100	584
Hamilton	- Less than 6 units	26.3	30.8	22.6	11.7	6.1	2.7	100	377
	- 6 units and more	28.6	32.9	24.6	7.9	5.7	0.3	100	720
Kingston	- Less than 6 units	24.1	30.0	29.1	10.5	5.0	1.4	100	220
	- 6 units and more	29.7	30.8	29.1	5.8	4.7	0.0	100	172
London	- Less than 6 units	25.1	30.0	29.6	11.2	4.0	0.0	100	223
	- 6 units and more	25.0	33.8	26.9	12.0	2.3	0.0	100	216
Sault Ste. Marie	- Less than 6 units	32.3	33.1	20.8	8.9	3.9	1.2	100	260
	- 6 units and more	30.5	37.6	24.1	5.0	2.8	0.0	100	141
Sudbury	- Less than 6 units	36.7	33.3	18.9	8.2	2.6	0.4	100	270
	- 6 units and more	28.6	36.1	27.1	6.0	2.3	0.0	100	133
Thunder Bay	- Less than 6 units	29.0	36.3	20.9	7.0	5.4	1.5	100	259
	- 6 units and more	26.2	37.9	25.5	5.5	4.8	0.0	100	145

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3.3

CURRENT QUALITY OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES BY  
ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME  
- TENANT PERCEPTION -

Municipality	Very Good				Poor		Very Poor		Unstated		Total (%)	Sample Size
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		
Metro Toronto	- Less than \$15,000	26.2	26.3	26.3	12.5	8.4	0.2	100	100	100	558	619
	- \$15,000 and over	32.2	27.5	22.9	10.3	5.7	1.5	100	100	100	519	
Ottawa	- Less than \$15,000	24.7	30.7	27.1	10.6	5.9	1.0	100	100	100	527	538
	- \$15,000 and over	33.6	32.0	21.8	8.4	2.6	1.7	100	100	100	527	
Hamilton	- Less than \$15,000	26.1	32.5	24.8	10.0	5.3	1.4	100	100	100	590	507
	- \$15,000 and over	29.8	31.8	22.9	8.3	6.5	0.8	100	100	100	507	
Kingston	- Less than \$15,000	28.8	30.0	26.8	8.8	5.2	0.4	100	100	100	250	142
	- \$15,000 and over	22.5	31.0	33.1	7.8	4.2	1.4	100	100	100	142	
London	- Less than \$15,000	22.1	34.7	28.7	10.6	3.9	0.0	100	100	100	254	185
	- \$15,000 and over	29.2	28.1	27.6	13.0	2.2	0.0	100	100	100	254	
Sault Ste. Marie	- Less than \$15,000	30.1	36.3	21.7	8.4	3.1	0.4	100	100	100	226	175
	- \$15,000 and over	33.7	32.6	22.3	6.3	4.0	1.1	100	100	100	226	
Sudbury	- Less than \$15,000	31.7	38.5	18.8	8.3	2.3	0.5	100	100	100	218	185
	- \$15,000 and over	36.8	29.2	24.9	6.5	2.7	0.0	100	100	100	218	
Thunder Bay	- Less than \$15,000	28.8	33.1	23.3	8.9	5.1	0.9	100	100	100	236	168
	- \$15,000 and over	26.8	42.3	21.4	3.0	5.4	1.2	100	100	100	236	

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3.4

 CHANGE IN LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES (NON-MOVERS)  
 - TENANT PERCEPTION -

Municipality	Improved			A Little Worse			A Lot Worse			Unstated		Total (%)	Sample Size
	a lot (%)	a Little (%)	Same (%)	A Little (%)	Worse (%)	A Lot (%)	Worse (%)	Unstated (%)	Total (%)				
Metro Toronto	7.2	12.5	67.5	8.4	3.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	100	79	3		
Ottawa	5.3	13.7	69.7	7.1	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	100	63	7		
Hamilton	6.1	12.1	70.7	7.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	100	69	0		
Kingston	11.9	17.1	62.5	6.8	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	100	17	6		
London	5.8	16.0	70.2	5.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	22	5		
Sault Ste. Marie	7.7	9.0	76.5	5.0	0.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	100	22	1		
Sudbury	5.6	14.5	72.2	3.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	24	1		
Thunder Bay	5.5	9.2	77.1	5.5	2.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	100	21	8		

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors  
 for these distributions. Percentages may  
 not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3.5

CHANGE IN LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES (NON-MOVERS)  
BY BUILDING SIZE  
- TENANT PERCEPTION -

Municipality	Improved			A Little Worse			A Little Worse			A Lot Worse			Unstated		Total		Sample Size	
	A Lot	A Little	Same	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		
Metro Toronto	- Less than 6 units	7.4	9.5	73.1	5.4	2.1	2.5	100	242	- 6 units and more	7.1	13.8	65.0	9.8	3.8	0.5	100	242
	- 6 units and more	7.1	13.8	65.0	9.8	3.8	0.5	100	551									
Ottawa	- Less than 6 units	6.7	10.4	72.2	4.4	2.4	4.0	100	298	- 6 units and more	4.1	16.5	67.6	9.4	2.1	0.3	100	339
	- 6 units and more	4.1	16.5	67.6	9.4	2.1	0.3	100	339									
Hamilton	- Less than 6 units	5.8	13.0	70.5	5.8	1.3	3.6	100	224	- 6 units and more	5.2	11.6	70.8	7.7	2.4	1.3	100	466
	- 6 units and more	5.2	11.6	70.8	7.7	2.4	1.3	100	466									
Kingston	- Less than 6 units	9.9	12.9	69.3	5.9	1.0	1.0	100	101	- 6 units and more	14.7	22.7	53.3	8.0	1.3	0.0	100	75
	- 6 units and more	14.7	22.7	53.3	8.0	1.3	0.0	100	75									
London	- Less than 6 units	7.4	10.2	74.1	6.5	1.9	0.0	100	108	- 6 units and more	4.3	21.4	66.7	4.3	3.4	0.0	100	117
	- 6 units and more	4.3	21.4	66.7	4.3	3.4	0.0	100	117									
Sault Ste. Marie	- Less than 6 units	9.2	8.5	75.9	3.6	0.7	2.1	100	141	- 6 units and more	5.0	10.0	77.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	100	80
	- 6 units and more	5.0	10.0	77.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	100	80									
Sudbury	- Less than 6 units	10.9	14.6	71.5	2.4	0.6	0.0	100	165	- 6 units and more	6.6	14.5	73.7	5.3	0.0	0.0	100	76
	- 6 units and more	6.6	14.5	73.7	5.3	0.0	0.0	100	76									
Thunder Bay	- Less than 6 units	6.6	8.8	79.4	2.9	1.5	0.7	100	136	6 units and more	3.7	9.8	73.2	9.8	3.7	0.0	100	82
	6 units and more	3.7	9.8	73.2	9.8	3.7	0.0	100	82									

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3.6

CHANGE IN LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES (NON-MOVERS)  
BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME  
- TENANT PERCEPTION -

Municipality	Improved			A Lot Worse			A Little Worse			Unstated			Total (%)	Sample Size
	A Lot (%)	Improved A Little (%)	Same (%)	A Lot Worse (%)	A Little Worse (%)	Unstated (%)								
Metro Toronto	- Less than \$15,000	6.6	15.2	65.3	8.9	3.4	0.6	100	100	0.6	1.6	1.6	349	349
	- \$15,000 and over	7.7	10.4	69.1	8.1	3.1	0.8	100	100	1.6	2.4	2.4	444	444
Ottawa	- Less than \$15,000	6.8	14.6	66.2	7.8	2.9	1.6	100	100	1.6	2.4	2.4	308	308
	- \$15,000 and over	4.0	12.8	73.0	6.4	1.5	0.5	100	100	1.6	2.4	2.4	329	329
Hamilton	- Less than \$15,000	7.3	10.1	70.4	8.1	2.0	2.0	100	100	2.0	2.0	2.0	345	345
	- \$15,000 and over	4.9	13.9	71.0	6.1	2.0	0.0	100	100	2.0	2.0	2.0	345	345
Kingston	- Less than \$15,000	11.3	17.5	61.9	7.2	2.1	0.0	100	100	0.0	1.3	1.3	97	97
	- \$15,000 and over	12.7	16.5	63.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	100	100	0.0	1.3	1.3	79	79
London	- Less than \$15,000	6.5	13.8	71.5	5.7	2.4	0.0	100	100	0.0	1.0	1.0	123	123
	- \$15,000 and over	4.9	18.6	68.6	4.9	2.9	0.0	100	100	0.0	1.0	1.0	102	102
Sault Ste. Marie	- Less than \$15,000	4.4	7.9	78.1	8.8	0.0	0.9	100	100	0.9	1.9	1.9	114	114
	- \$15,000 and over.	11.2	10.3	74.8	0.9	0.9	0.0	100	100	0.0	1.0	1.0	107	107
Sudbury	- Less than \$15,000	9.3	14.4	72.9	3.4	0.0	0.0	100	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	118	118
	- \$15,000 and over	9.8	14.6	71.5	3.3	0.8	0.0	100	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	123	123
Thunder Bay	- Less than \$15,000	5.3	8.4	76.3	6.1	3.1	0.8	100	100	0.8	1.2	1.2	131	131
	- \$15,000 and over	5.8	10.3	78.2	4.6	1.2	0.0	100	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	87	87

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3.7

CURRENT QUALITY OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES  
 - TENANT PERCEPTION -  
 (1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	Good (%)	Adequate (%)	Poor (%)	Unstated (%)	Total (%)	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	1977 56.1	24.4	17.9	0.6	100	1,054
	1978 56.2	24.6	18.4	0.8	100	1,177
Ottawa	1977 61.9	22.7	14.1	1.3	100	1,038
	1978 60.0	23.9	15.0	1.1	100	1,097
Hamilton	1977 61.9	23.6	13.6	0.9	100	1,102
	1978 60.6	24.4	13.7	1.3	100	1,065
Kingston	1977 58.1	28.1	13.3	0.5	100	406
	1978 57.0	28.2	14.8	0.0	100	439
London	1977 60.0	24.4	14.2	1.4	100	422
	1978 56.9	29.1	12.2	0.8	100	392
Sault Ste. Marie	1977 65.3	21.1	12.3	1.3	100	455
	1978 66.4	21.9	11.0	0.7	100	401
Sudbury	1977 65.5	19.0	13.8	1.7	100	400
	1978 68.2	21.6	9.9	0.3	100	403
Thunder Bay	1977 57.8	23.8	15.5	2.9	100	522
	1978 64.9	22.5	11.6	1.0	100	404

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
 Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3.8

 CHANGE IN LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE AND SERVICES (NON-MOVERS)  
 - TENANT PERCEPTION -  
 (1977 AND 1978 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	Better (%)		Same (%)	Worse (%)	Unstated (%)	Total (%)	Sample Size (%)
Metro Toronto	1977*	19.5	63.1	14.5	2.9	100	650
	1978**	19.7	67.5	11.7	1.1	100	793
Ottawa	1977	14.9	72.0	11.4	1.7	100	650
	1978	19.0	69.7	9.3	2.0	100	637
Hamilton	1977	22.3	63.0	13.0	1.7	100	645
	1978	18.2	70.7	9.1	2.0	100	690
Kingston	1977	19.4	68.0	9.9	2.7	100	222
	1978	29.0	62.5	7.9	0.6	100	176
London	1977	16.2	73.3	10.0	0.5	100	191
	1978	21.8	70.2	8.0	0.0	100	225
Sault Ste. Marie	1977	21.6	70.2	6.5	1.7	100	292
	1978	16.7	76.5	5.4	1.4	100	221
Subdury	1977	22.0	68.9	7.9	1.2	100	254
	1978	24.1	72.2	3.7	0.0	100	241
Thunder Bay	1977	19.8	70.8	7.0	2.4	100	298
	1978	14.7	77.1	7.8	0.4	100	218

\*1977 Survey (September '76-September '77)

\*\*1978 Survey (October '77-October '77)

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
 Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

IV. TECHNICAL APPENDIX

The Rental Market Survey report is based on an analysis of 5,376 telephone interviews with renters in eight Ontario cities, conducted between October 1 to October 31, 1978 from the central telephone facility of Canadian Facts Company Limited in Toronto, Ontario.

The 1978 survey represents a replication of the September 1977 Rental Market Survey (i.e. the 1978 Survey utilized the same sampling procedures, the tenants responded to almost the same set of questions and in general the same field procedures were used in 1978 as were used in the 1977 Survey).

Survey Sample

Table 4.1 indicates the number of interviews carried out in each of the surveyed cities: Metro Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, London, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury and Thunder Bay.

In each city, a probability sample was drawn for telephone interviews. The sampling technique used for this survey is referred to as replicated random digit dialling - telephone directory. The procedure involved random selection of numbers from the telephone directory of each city and the raising of each selected number by a fixed

number. This RDD sampling technique reduced the sampling bias arising from telephone numbers not listed in the phone book.

The survey included renters living in duplexes, townhouses, single family houses, rooms and those living in flats or apartments in both low and high rise buildings. Those living in government assisted housing, who are excluded from the Rent Review Program, were also excluded from this survey.

Telephone interviews were conducted with the male or female heads of rental households. An initial telephone call, and up to seven callbacks at different times of the day and on different days, were made for each randomly selected telephone number. No substitution was allowed for telephone numbers initially selected. The response rates for all cities were 67% or higher. Such response rates should be regarded as generally very high for surveys of this type (telephone interviews with rental households).

#### Sample Survey Errors

The statistics produced by this survey are derived from a sample, and hence, are apt to differ somewhat from the actual values being estimated. This occurs because of two types of errors possible in an estimate based on a sample survey - sampling error and non-sampling error. Sampling

error is the difference that may result in answers from the sample compared to what would have been obtained if the whole rental population had been interviewed. The size of such sampling errors depends largely on the number of interviews. The non-sampling errors can be attributed to many sources: inability to obtain information about all cases in the sample, definitional difficulties, differences in the interpretation of questions, inability or unwillingness to provide correct information on the part of the respondents, mistakes in recording data obtained and other errors of collection, response and processing. Explicit measures of these non-sampling errors are generally not available. However, it is believed that most of the important response and operational errors were detected and corrected during the survey.

#### Reliability of Estimates

As indicated above, the non-sampling error is very difficult to estimate. However, guide to the potential size of the sampling error is provided by the standard error of the estimate. The following Table 4.2 may be used in estimating the standard error of any percentage in this report. The estimate and its associated standard error may be used to construct a confidence interval, that is, an interval having a 95 percent probability (19 chances out of 20) that it would include the average result of all possible

samples (see Table 4.2 for an illustration). Similarly Table 4.3 provides standard errors for average rents by size of unit.

Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 provide sample distributions by unit size, by building size and by dwelling unit type, respectively. These tables are included to provide a reference for results which are based on these classifications of the overall sample.

TABLE 4.1SAMPLE SIZES

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Metro Toronto	1,177
Ottawa	1,065
Hamilton	1,097
Kingston	392
London	439
Sault Ste. Marie	401
Sudbury	403
Thunder Bay	404

TABLE 4.2  
APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS OF PERCENTAGES  
 (In Percentage points at 95% Confidence Level\*)

	<u>Sample Size</u>						
	<u>1200</u>	<u>1000</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>100</u>
Percentages near 10	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.5	3.0	4.2	6.0
Percentages near 20	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.3	4.0	5.7	8.0
Percentages near 30	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.8	4.6	6.5	9.2
Percentages near 40	2.8	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.9	6.0	9.8
Percentages near 50	2.9	3.2	3.6	4.1	5.0	7.1	10.0
Percentages near 60	2.8	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.9	6.9	9.8
Percentages near 70	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.8	4.6	6.5	9.2
Percentages near 80	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.3	4.0	5.7	8.0
Percentages near 90	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.5	3.0	4.2	6.0

\* The chances are 95 in 100 that the standard error is not larger than the figures shown.

Example: Let us say a reported percentage is 31 percent for a group with sample of 600 respondents. Then we go to row "percentages near 30" in the above table and go across to the column headed "600". The standard error at this point is "3.8", which means that the 31% obtained in the survey is subject to a sampling error of plus or minus 3.8. Put differently the chances are 95 out of 100 that the true estimate lies between 27.2 and 34.8.

TABLE 4.3

OCTOBER 1978 AVERAGE RENTS BY UNIT SIZE  
WITH STANDARD ERRORS (95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL)

Municipality	1 Bedroom		2 Bedroom		3 Bedroom		All Units	
	\$	239 <sup>+</sup> 5.0	\$	293 <sup>+</sup> 6.8	\$	343 <sup>+</sup> 17.4	\$	273 <sup>+</sup> 5.6 **
Metro Toronto	\$227 <sup>+</sup> 5.2		\$275 <sup>+</sup> 7.0		\$302 <sup>+</sup> 13.2		\$259 <sup>+</sup> 5.2	
Ottawa	\$190 <sup>+</sup> 3.8		\$235 <sup>+</sup> 5.4		\$270 <sup>+</sup> 10.2		\$224 <sup>+</sup> 4.4	
Hamilton	\$185 <sup>+</sup> 8.6		\$216 <sup>+</sup> 8.2		*		\$229 <sup>+</sup> 10.4	
Kingston	\$193 <sup>+</sup> 6.4		\$227 <sup>+</sup> 7.2		*		\$223 <sup>+</sup> 5.6	
London								
Sault Ste. Marie	\$187 <sup>+</sup> 8.0		\$230 <sup>+</sup> 7.6		*		\$214 <sup>+</sup> 6.0	
Sudbury	\$176 <sup>+</sup> 10.6		\$190 <sup>+</sup> 8.6		*		\$196 <sup>+</sup> 6.6	
Thunder Bay	\$203 <sup>+</sup> 8.8		\$252 <sup>+</sup> 11.2		*		\$236 <sup>+</sup> 8.2	

\* No estimates calculated due to small sample size.

\*\* The chances are about 95 out of 100 (95%) that the true average rent for Metro Toronto lies between \$267.40 and \$278.60.

TABLE 4.4

## SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY UNIT SIZE

Municipality	Room and Bachelor (%)	One Bedroom (%)	Two Bedroom (%)	Three or More (%)	Total (%)	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	9.2	38.0	38.2	14.6	100	1,177
Ottawa	8.8	33.7	34.6	22.9	100	1,065
Hamilton	4.4	35.3	41.6	18.8	100	1,097
Kingston	6.4	27.3	40.1	26.3	100	392
London	5.2	30.1	41.9	22.8	100	439
Sault Ste. Marie	5.2	35.2	41.9	17.7	100	401
Sudbury	6.9	25.1	42.4	25.6	100	403
Thunder Bay	7.4	34.9	38.4	19.3	100	404

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions.  
 Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 4.5

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	Six Units Or More	Less Than Six Units	Total	Sample Size
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Metro Toronto	68.7	31.3	100	1,177
Ottawa	54.8	45.2	100	1,065
Hamilton	65.6	34.4	100	1,097
Kingston	43.9	56.1	100	392
London	49.2	50.8	100	439
Sault Ste. Marie	35.2	64.8	100	401
Sudbury	33.0	67.0	100	403
Thunder Bay	35.9	64.1	100	404

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 4.6

## SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY DWELLING TYPE

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Duplex</u>	<u>Row or Townhouse</u>	<u>Room</u>	<u>Apartment Or Flat</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	
Metro Toronto	6.9	4.1	3.8	2.5	82.8	100	1,177
Ottawa	8.4	8.0	12.5	2.3	68.8	100	1,065
Hamilton	10.0	5.6	7.8	1.6	74.9	100	1,097
Kingston	14.3	7.7	8.7	1.5	67.9	100	392
London	9.3	8.2	15.5	1.4	65.6	100	439
Sault Ste. Marie	20.2	9.7	2.0	1.3	66.6	100	401
Sudbury	18.6	11.9	7.2	2.0	58.6	100	403
Thunder Bay	19.3	6.4	5.9	2.2	65.6	100	404

Note: Refer to Table 4.2 for standard errors for these distributions. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.





